United Nations CAC/COSP/IRG/I/3/1/Add.24*

Conference of the States Parties to the United Nations Convention against Corruption

Distr.: General
29 May 2015

Original: English

Implementation Review Group
Resumed sixth session
Saint Petersburg, Russian Federation, 3-4 November 2015
Item 2 of the provisional agenda**
Review of implementation of the United Nations Convention against Corruption

Executive summary

Note by the Secretariat

Addendum

Contents

		Page
II.	Executive summary	2
	Qatar	2

* Reissued for technical reasons on 8 July 2015.
** CAC/COSP/IRG/2015/1.

V.15-03855 (E) 050615 080615

Please recycle

II. Executive summary

Qatar

1. Introduction: Overview of the legal and institutional framework of Qatar in the context of implementation of the United Nations Convention against Corruption

Qatar signed the Convention on 1 December 2005 and ratified it by Decree 17 of 2007 on 30 January 2007. The Convention entered into force for Qatar on 1 March 2007.

The relationship between national and international law is dualistic in the Qatari legal system, and treaties including the Convention are not self-executing and have to be implemented into Qatari legislation (art. 6 of the Constitution).

Qatar is a hereditary constitutional monarchy. With the Constitution of 2003, Qatar adopted the principle of separation of powers (art. 60). The legislative authority is vested in the Shura Council in accordance with the Constitution, and the Executive power is vested in the Emir, assisted by the Council of Ministers. Courts are divided into criminal and civil courts, at two levels. A Supreme Council supervises the proper functioning of courts of law and their auxiliary organs. The judicial system also includes the Constitutional Court.

The institutions most relevant in the fight against corruption are the Public Prosecution office, which has a dedicated department handling corruption and money-laundering cases, the Administrative Control and Transparency Authority and Qatar Financial Information Unit (FIU).

2. Chapter III: Criminalization and law enforcement

2.1. Observations on the implementation of the articles under review

Bribery and trading in influence (arts. 15, 16, 18 and 21)

Qatar criminalizes active bribery of national public officials pursuant to article 141 read in conjunction with article 140 of the Penal Code (PC), provided that the offer or the promise is accepted. The same penalty applies to the intermediary.

Article 145 PC applies if the bribe offer is declined. However, this article does not explicitly cover the "promise".

Qatar criminalizes passive bribery of national public officials (art. 140 PC). Articles 142, 143 and 144 are also relevant.

Qatar does not criminalize active or passive bribery of foreign public officials and officials of public international organizations.

Article 154 PC criminalizes passive trading in influence by limited categories of public officials and does not cover "any other person".

Active trading in influence, when the offence of article 154 is committed, could be prosecuted pursuant to article 40 on participation.

Qatar criminalizes passive bribery in the private sector (art. 146 PC). Active bribery in the private sector, when the offence of article 146 is committed, could be prosecuted pursuant to article 40 on participation.

Money-laundering, concealment (arts. 23 and 24)

Article 72 read in conjunction with article 1 of Law No. 4 of 2010, promulgating the Law of Combating Money-Laundering and Terrorism Financing (AML Law) criminalizes the laundering of proceeds of crime.

Qatar criminalizes the attempt to commit a money-laundering offence (art. 72 AML Law). Other ancillary offences are adequately covered (art. 2 AML Law and the general provisions of the PC (Participation: art. 40; Conspiracy, abetting, facilitating and counselling: art. 39; Aiding: art. 38)).

In determining predicate offences, Qatar has adopted a mixed approach. According to article 2 of the AML Law, predicate offences include all felonies, all offences covered under the international conventions signed and ratified by Qatar, in addition to a list of offences. Predicate offences include offences committed both within and outside Qatar provided that dual criminality is met.

Article 2 of the AML Law explicitly criminalizes self-laundering.

Concealment of proceeds of crime is established as a separate offence (article 367 PC).

Embezzlement, abuse of functions and illicit enrichment (arts. 17, 19, 20 and 22)

Article 149 PC covers embezzlement, misappropriation or other diversion of property by a public official when such property is owned by the State or a number of other authorities.

Embezzlement of other properties (i.e. private funds or securities) is criminalized (art. 148 PC); however, this article does not explicitly cover "misappropriation or other diversion".

Qatar criminalizes the abuse of functions in the public sector (art. 160 PC). With respect to money-laundering, the abuse of functions in the private sector is an aggravating circumstance (art. 72 AML Law).

Qatar does not criminalize illicit enrichment.

Qatar criminalizes embezzlement of property in the private sector (art. 362 PC). However, this article only covers "property, bonds or other movable properties" and does not extend to immovable properties. Embezzlement of such properties might be criminalized pursuant to the general provisions of article 355 on fraud.

Obstruction of justice (art. 25)

The use of physical force, threats or intimidation or the promise, offering or giving of an undue advantage to induce false testimony or to interfere in the giving of testimony is criminalized (art. 175 PC), even if the intended purpose is not achieved. Whoever testifies in front of a court is considered a witness, including experts.

Qatar does not criminalize the use of physical force, threats or intimidation or the promise, offering or giving of an undue advantage to interfere in the production of evidence. However, articles 183 and 184 of the PC on "evidence manipulation" in conjunction with article 39, paragraph 1 on incitement could apply to cases of the

promise, offering or giving of an undue advantage to interfere in the production of evidence in proceedings when the intended purpose is achieved.

Article 168 PC criminalizes the use of force, violence or threat to interfere with the exercise of official duties by a public official.

Liability of legal persons (art. 26)

Qatar establishes the criminal liability of legal persons (art. 37 PC). Such liability does not preclude the criminal liability of the natural persons who have committed the offences.

Civil liability of legal persons is also recognized in the Civil Code (arts. 54, 199 and 209).

Legal persons which are held criminally liable might be subject to a maximum fine of five hundred thousand Qatari Riyals (around 137,000 USD). In money-laundering cases, such fine cannot be less than five million Qatari Riyals (art. 75 of the AML Law).

Participation and attempt (art. 27)

The PC regulates participation (arts. 38, 39 and 40) and attempt (arts. 28-31).

While the attempt of any felony is criminalized, attempted misdemeanours are only criminalized if explicitly foreseen by the law. This leaves the attempt to commit some offences established in accordance with the Convention not criminalized (art. 146 PC: bribery in the private sector; art. 160 PC: abuse of functions; art. 362 PC: embezzlement in the private sector; art. 175 PC: induction of false testimony or interference in the giving of testimony).

Qatar does not criminalize the preparation of an offence.

Prosecution, adjudication and sanctions; cooperation with law enforcement authorities (arts. 30 and 37)

Qatar has adopted penalties for offences established in accordance with the Convention that range from a fine up to ten years' imprisonment, taking into account the gravity of the offence, in addition to accessory or complementary penalties.

Immunities do not seem to constitute an impediment to the prosecution of such offences. Only members of the Shura Council benefit from immunity, except for when they are caught in the commission of an offence (art. 113 of the Constitution). During the sessions of the Council, the authorization of the Council is required, and in intercessional periods, the authorization of the president of the Council to lift immunities.

Qatar does not have a system of mandatory prosecution. There is no general law regulating how this discretionary authority should be exercised. The most relevant factor that is taken into account is, among others, the gravity of the offence. In the event the prosecutor refuses to move forward with prosecution, there is recourse to the Attorney General, and then to the court.

Preventive detention can be applied for offences established in accordance with the Convention. Release pending trial is possible with or without bail (arts. 119 and 120 of the Criminal Procedure Code (CPC)).

Early release is possible if three quarters of the prison sentence have been completed and if all financial obligations have been settled. The conditional release is ordered by the Public Prosecutor upon request of the Minister of Interior or his representative (art. 360 CPC and art. 67 of Law on the Regulation of Penal and Correctional Institutions).

Public officials can be suspended for not longer than 30 days if the interests of the investigation require such measures. In addition, public officials are considered suspended if they are in preventive detention (arts. 134 and 135 of the Law on Human Resources Management).

The PC provides for the sanction of removal/disqualification from holding public office and office in an enterprise owned in whole or in part by the State (mainly arts. 66, 70, 147 and 158).

Disciplinary sanctions can be issued under the Law on Human Resources Management (arts. 122-155). Both disciplinary and criminal sanctions can be imposed in corruption cases.

The Law on the Regulation of Penal and Correctional Institutions contains dedicated measures to facilitate the social reintegration of prisoners. Moreover, pursuant to the CPC, the convicted person may ask for his/her rehabilitation after a period following serving the sentence.

Cooperation with law enforcement authorities may be taken into account in bribery and money-laundering cases, where persons collaborating with justice can benefit from an exemption from punishment if they report the offence before it comes to the knowledge of the authorities (arts. 141 and 144 PC, art. 83 AML Law). For all other offences, the general provisions of article 46 of the PC apply. If the authorities are notified after they have begun their investigation, exemption from punishment becomes conditional on the arrest of the conspirators.

For offences that may cause damage to national economy and public benefits, the Public Prosecutor can settle the case prior to referral to the Court (art. 18 CPC).

Qatar has not established measures to protect persons cooperating with justice.

Protection of witnesses and reporting persons (arts. 32 and 33)

Qatar has not established measures to protect witnesses, victims, persons providing information in the case and persons close to them. The Qatari legislation does not enable the views and concerns of victims, regarding their safety, to be presented and considered during criminal proceedings.

Qatar has not established the legal protection of reporting persons.

Freezing, seizing and confiscation; bank secrecy (arts. 31 and 40)

Article 76 of the PC regulates the confiscation, upon conviction of a crime or misdemeanour, of proceeds of crime and instrumentalities used or destined for use in the commission of offences. Article 77 of the AML Law is also applicable to

confiscation regarding money-laundering and predicate offences, including corruption offences. This article provides for value-based confiscation and for the confiscation of transformed, converted and intermingled criminal proceeds, in addition to income or other benefits derived from such proceeds.

In money-laundering cases, article 77 of the AML Law also provides for non-conviction based confiscation when the perpetrator is unknown or dead.

The CPC (arts. 63-81) and the AML Law (arts. 20 and 46-48) provide for a wide range of investigative measures for the identification, tracing, freezing or seizure of criminal proceeds and instrumentalities. Measures provided for in the AML Law also apply to predicate offences, including corruption offences.

Both the CPC (arts. 126 and 145) and the AML Law (arts. 51 and 79-81) contain measures to regulate frozen, seized and confiscated property, including the establishment of an Office at the Public Prosecution responsible for the administration of seized and confiscated assets.

Qatar has not established the inversion of the burden of proof regarding the lawful origin of alleged proceeds of crime.

Bank secrecy does not appear to be an obstacle to criminal investigations. Article 46 of the AML Law empowers the Attorney General to order that bank, financial and commercial records be made available in any money-laundering and predicate offences cases.

Statute of limitations; criminal record (arts. 29 and 41)

Article 14 of the CPC foresees a statute of limitations of ten years for crimes, three years for misdemeanours and one year for contraventions, starting from the date of the commission of the offence. For embezzlement in the public sector, the period starts from the end of service or capacity, unless investigations started before that date.

The statute of limitations for bribery in the private sector (art. 146 PC), abuse of functions (art. 160 CPC), embezzlement in the private sector (art. 362 PC), and induction of false testimony or interference in the giving of testimony (art. 175 PC) is three years. All other offences established in accordance with the Convention are felonies in Qatar and hence their statute of limitations is ten years.

Qatar has not adopted measures to take into consideration previous foreign convictions of alleged offenders for the purpose of using such information in criminal proceedings.

Jurisdiction (art. 42)

The PC establishes Qatar's jurisdiction with regard to most circumstances referred to in article 42 (territorial jurisdiction: arts. 13 and 14, active personal jurisdiction: art. 18, jurisdiction referred to in para. 1.c: art. 13), with the exception of corruption offences committed abroad by a stateless person who has his or her habitual residence in its territory and corruption offences committed against a Qatari citizen or against Qatar.

The principle *aut dedere aut judicare* is not regulated in Qatar by statutory law. It is recognized only when the alleged offender is Qatari. In that case, article 18 on active personal jurisdiction applies.

Consequences of acts of corruption; compensation for damage (arts. 34 and 35)

Qatar has taken measures to address the consequences of corruption, including the termination of procurement contracts tainted by corruption (Emir Decision No. 75 of 2011 on establishment of the Administrative Control and Transparency Authority).

Articles 199 to 207 of the Civil Code establish the civil liability for damages. In trials for criminal offences, civil compensation for damage caused by the accused can be solicited during the investigation or before the court hearing the criminal case (art. 19 CPC).

Specialized authorities and inter-agency coordination (arts. 36, 38 and 39)

Qatar has several specialized authorities to combat corruption through law enforcement. Alongside the police and the Public Prosecution, which has a dedicated department handling corruption and money-laundering cases, Qatar recently created the Administrative Control and Transparency Authority. This Authority, which is directly linked to the Emir, is invested with large powers to prevent and investigate corruption.

Qatar's FIU also plays an important role in the fight against money-laundering and corruption. These bodies appear to receive adequate training and resources, and are sufficiently independent.

Regarding cooperation between national authorities, the CPC (art. 33) and PC (art. 189) establish an obligation by public officials to report offences which come to their knowledge during the exercise of or because of their functions.

The AML Law establishes the obligation of a number of private sector entities, including banks, financial institutions, insurance companies, audit firms and lawyers, to report to the FIU any suspicious transactions and to provide it with any additional information which it may request (arts. 15 and 18). The FIU has been also engaged in raising awareness activities addressed to the private sector entities. The CPC (art. 32) and the PC (art. 186) establish a general obligation to report offences to the relevant authorities.

2.2. Successes and good practices

- With respect to money-laundering, the abuse of functions in the private sector is an aggravating circumstance pursuant to article 72 of the AML Law (art. 19);
- The absence of a statutory maximum fine for legal persons in money-laundering cases was considered to be conducive to deterrence and was positively noted by the reviewing team (art. 26, para. 4);
- The Public Prosecution has implemented a practice whereby criminal case files can be remotely tracked by supervisors to monitor progress (art. 36).

2.3. Challenges in implementation

It is recommended that Qatar:

- Criminalize the promise of a bribe to a national public official, even when such promise is declined (art. 15, para. 1);
- Criminalize the active bribery of foreign public officials and officials of public international organizations (art. 16, para. 1) and consider establishing the passive version of the offence (art. 16, para. 2);
- With regard to trading in influence, consider reviewing its legislation to include all public official and other persons (art. 18);
- Explicitly criminalize the misappropriation or other diversion by a public official of any property including private funds or securities or any other thing of value entrusted to the public official by virtue of his or her position (art. 17);
- Consider criminalizing illicit enrichment (art. 20);
- Criminalize the use of physical force, threats or intimidation or the promise, offering or giving of an undue advantage to interfere in the production of evidence in proceedings in relation to the commission of offences under the Convention against Corruption (art. 25 (a));
- Consider the possibility of requiring that an offender demonstrate the lawful origin of property liable to confiscation (art. 31, para. 8);
- Take appropriate measures to provide effective protection for witnesses and experts who give testimony concerning corruption offences and, as appropriate, for their relatives and other persons close to them. Such measures shall apply to victims insofar as they are witnesses and might include the use of communications technology (audio-visual) in hearings (art. 32, paras. 1, 2 and 4);
- Enable the views and concerns of victims to be presented and considered during criminal proceedings (art. 32, para. 5);
- Consider taking appropriate measures to provide effective protection against any unjustified treatment for reporting persons (art. 33);
- Take appropriate measures to provide effective protection for offenders who cooperate with justice concerning offences established in accordance with the Convention and, as appropriate, for their relatives and other persons close to them (art. 37, para. 4);
- Qatar may wish to adopt measures to take into consideration previous foreign convictions of alleged offenders for the purpose of using such information in criminal proceedings (art. 41);
- Qatar may wish to establish its jurisdiction with regard to corruption offences committed abroad by stateless persons who have their habitual residence in its territory and corruption offences committed against Qatari citizens or against Qatar (art. 42, paras. 2a, 2b and 2d);

- Generally with respect to criminalization and law enforcement, the reviewers encourage Qatar to develop appropriate systems to collect statistics of relevant cases.

3. Chapter IV: International cooperation

3.1. Observations on the implementation of the articles under review

Extradition; transfer of sentenced persons; transfer of criminal proceedings (arts. 44, 45 and 47)

Extradition is governed by the CPC and international treaties and conventions, namely the Riyadh Arab Agreement on Judicial Cooperation of 1983 and the principle of reciprocity. Dual criminality is generally a condition for extradition, and the law provides for a minimum penalty requirement: according to article 409, the crime for which extradition is requested must be a felony or misdemeanour punishable according to the Qatari laws and the laws of the requesting State by at least two years or a more aggravated penalty; or the person whose extradition is requested must be sentenced to imprisonment for a period of at least six months. The minimum penalty and dual criminality requirements can be waived if the person whose extradition is sought is a citizen of the requesting country, or a citizen of another country which implements the same penalty. Extradition is limited to the extent that Qatar has not criminalized all offences under the Convention.

Extradition is not allowed if the crimes for which extradition is sought are numerous, except for those crimes which satisfy the dual criminality and minimum punishment threshold. A Convention-based offence would not be treated as a political offence in case the Convention was used as a basis for extradition.

Qatar indicated that it considers this Convention as the legal basis for extradition in respect of corruption-related offences. With respect to States with which it does not have an extradition treaty, Qatar may elect to extradite in accordance with the provisions of its domestic legislation, upon a basis of reciprocity.

The CPC sets out the rules for extraditing accused persons and takes into account expediting and simplifying extradition procedures without infringing on the rights of accused or convicted persons requested to be extradited.

Qatar does not extradite its nationals to stand trial in other countries, nor does its law permit the enforcement of a foreign penal sentence under these circumstances. If Qatar refuses to extradite any of its citizens who has committed an offence within or outside the Qatari territory, the provisions of the Qatari Penal Code apply to such person, according to articles 16 and 18 PC.

The individual rights of persons wanted for extradition are protected both with respect to the procedural and substantive aspects of their extradition.

A requested person shall not be extradited if there are grounds to suspect, among others, that the request for extradition was submitted for reasons of discrimination against the wanted person on the basis of race, religion, nationality or political opinion, or if the crime for which extradition is requested is a political crime or connected to a political crime. Extradition requests will not be refused for criminal offences on the sole ground that the offence is also considered to involve fiscal matters. The grounds for refusal are mandatory, not permissive.

Qatar consults, as a matter of practice, with requesting States before refusing extradition.

The transfer of detained persons to Qatar is regulated in articles 434 to 439 of the CPC. The transfer of prisoners from Qatar to another State is regulated in articles 440 to 443 of the CPC. There are no agreements on prisoner transfer, which is handled on the basis of reciprocity.

There is no specific law or practice on the transfer of criminal proceedings.

Mutual legal assistance (art. 46)

Mutual legal assistance (MLA) is regulated in Part 4 (arts. 427 to 433) of the CPC. The procedure for incoming and outgoing requests is regulated in articles 427 to 431 and 432 to 433, respectively. There are no restrictions regarding legal persons.

The existence of a treaty is not a prerequisite to provide MLA. Since 2003, Qatar has entered into four bilateral treaties, which contain MLA provisions: Saudi Arabia, Yemen, Turkey and Bahrain. MLA is mainly handled on the basis of the Riyadh Agreement. International conventions are the source of the legal rules applied by Qatar with respect to international cooperation, taking into account the rules of the CPC. The spontaneous transmission of information to competent authorities of other States is a part of informal law enforcement cooperation.

Dual criminality is not a requirement for MLA (art. 428 of the CPC). However, in accordance with article 428(3), assistance must be refused if the offence is not extraditable. The provision of non-coercive assistance is not addressed in the legislation, although Qatari authorities indicated that as a matter of practice assistance is rendered in simple or other cases that do not have coercive procedures without looking to whether the conditions for dual criminality are satisfied.

The Attorney General is the Central Authority for purposes of MLA (art. 427 of the CPC). It is expected that requests will be submitted in writing. In cases of urgency, and upon the request of the applicant country, necessary measures can be undertaken before arrival of the application, until it is received (art. 427 of the CPC). There are no internal deadlines regarding the processing of MLA requests.

Assistance will be performed in the manner requested so long as this does not violate Qatari law (arts. 427 and 430 of the CPC). Although Qatar preserves the confidentiality of MLA requests in practice, the matter is specified in its legislation only in relation to money-laundering offences. The hearing of testimony by way of videoconference is possible, so long as the request does not contravene Qatari law. Qatar's legislation does not address a limitation on the use of information obtained through MLA.

There are a number of grounds for refusing assistance. Assistance shall be refused if the crime for which the request is intended to be executed is one for which extradition is not allowed. Qatar would not refuse a request relating to an offence under the Convention simply because it involves fiscal elements. Although bank secrecy is not a ground for refusal under the CPC, the legislation only addresses the disclosure of information covered by bank secrecy for purposes of MLA in relation to money-laundering offences.

Assistance may be postponed if it would interfere with an ongoing domestic criminal proceeding in cases where the person sought is being investigated for another crime committed in Qatar. Qatar would communicate grounds for refusing assistance to requesting States as a matter of practice, although the matter is specified in its legislation only in respect of money-laundering offences. Qatar's legislation does not provide for a duty to consult *before* refusing or postponing assistance in relation to offences under the Convention.

The transfer of prisoners for providing testimony or evidence is possible in accordance with general provisions in the CPC (e.g., art. 427) and the AML Law (art. 58(2)); however, the consent of the person transferred is not required, and the custody of the prisoner, credit for service of the sentence and safe conduct are not addressed. Similarly, for witness transfers, the consent of the person transferred and safe conduct are not addressed.

The issue of costs of MLA is addressed in the CPC in respect of deposits for fees and charges of experts during the execution of MLA requests (art. 429).

Provisions on the disclosure of government records, documents or information are found in the AML Law.

Law enforcement cooperation; joint investigations; special investigative techniques (arts. 48, 49 and 50)

Law enforcement cooperation with foreign authorities is implemented on the basis of bilateral and multilateral agreements, the INTERPOL network and on a case-by-case basis. Aside from the legal basis for MLA under the CPC and cooperation in respect of money-laundering offences under the AML Law, CPC, relevant agreements and the principle of reciprocity, no detailed domestic framework for the provision of law enforcement cooperation exists. This does not, however, appear to have prevented Qatar from providing such cooperation in practice. This Convention may be considered as the basis for mutual law enforcement cooperation.

Joint investigations are possible under existing legislation, international conventions or bilateral agreements. However, there have not been joint investigations in corruption matters.

Law enforcement authorities conduct special investigative techniques, including electronic and other forms of surveillance and covert operations. Relevant measures are found in the CPC (arts. 425 and 426). Article 65 of the AML Law allows the conduct of joint investigations on a case-by-case basis, in the absence of bilateral or multilateral arrangements.

3.3. Challenges in implementation

To further strengthen existing measures, it is recommended that Qatar:

- Ensure that all offences under the Convention are extraditable by virtue of the minimum period of imprisonment and the dual criminality principle (art. 44, para. 7).
- Include in its legislation ethnic origin among the grounds for refusing extradition on the basis of the discriminatory purpose of the request (art. 44, para. 15).

- Formalize its existing practice of consulting with requesting States before refusing extradition (art. 44, para. 17).
- Adopt measures to enable it to provide non-coercive assistance in the absence of dual criminality, and also in cases where assistance must be refused under article 428(3) CPC on the ground that the offences are not extraditable due to the minimum period of imprisonment (art. 46, para. 9).
- Adopt measures clearly providing that assistance will not be declined on the ground of bank secrecy in cases involving offences under the Convention (art. 46, para. 8).
- For purposes of prisoner transfers to provide testimony or evidence, adopt measures addressing the consent of the person transferred, custody of the prisoner, credit for service of the sentence, and safe conduct (art. 46, paras. 10-12).
- Specify the language requirements for MLA and whether MLA requests must be in writing (art. 46, para. 14).
- Make the requisite notifications of its central authority and acceptable languages for MLA to the United Nations (art. 46, paras. 13 and 14).
- In the interest of greater legal certainty, specify the content requirements for incoming MLA requests (art. 46, paras. 15 and 16).
- Adopt a relevant provision addressing the limitation on use of information obtained through MLA (art. 46, para. 19).
- Adopt a provision on the confidentiality of MLA requests in respect of all offences under the Convention (art. 46, para. 20).
- Specify in its legislation that reasons will be given for refusing MLA in relation to offences under the Convention apart from money-laundering (art. 46, para. 23).
- Continue to strengthen measures to ensure the expedited execution of MLA requests. Qatar may also wish to adopt guidelines specifying that updates will be provided on the status of execution of requests (art. 46, para. 24).
- Specify the duty to consult *before* refusing assistance in respect of all offences under the Convention (art. 46, para. 26).
- More clearly specify the issue of costs for MLA (art. 46, para. 28).
- Address the disclosure of government records, documents or information in cases involving offences under the Convention other than money-laundering (art. 46, para. 29).
- Qatar may wish to allow for extradition in cases involving crimes related to extraditable crimes (art. 44, para. 3).
- Qatar may wish to adopt measures providing that assistance may be postponed if it would interfere with ongoing domestic criminal proceedings also in cases where the person sought is not being investigated for other crimes committed in Qatar (art. 46, para. 25).

- In case of witness transfers (art. 46, para. 27), Qatar may wish to adopt measures providing for the consent of the person transferred and safe conduct.

- The reviewers welcome the efforts being made to establish a case management system in the Office of the Public Prosecution, which would allow the authorities to collect statistics on the type of international cooperation requests (e.g., underlying offences), the time frame for responding to these requests, and the response provided, including any grounds for refusal.